

DOCKET NO: 250560US0



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

:

SHINSUKE TOYOMASU, ET AL.

: EXAMINER: G. MESH

SERIAL NO: 10/802,851

:

FILED: MARCH 18, 2004

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1711

FOR: RESIN COMPOSITION FOR OPTICAL FILM, OPTICAL FILM AND PROCESS
FOR PRODUCING THE OPTICAL FILM

RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2006, please amend the above-identified application as follows.

In the Office Action of December 11, 2006, the Examiner refers to a reply filed on September 10, 2006. However, no Amendment was filed on that date. Applicants previously filed a response on October 4, 2006. A review of the PAIR system shows that apparently the correct Amendment as filed October 4, 2006, is in the Patent Office computer system. It is thus not clear why the Examiner refers to a response filed on September 10, 2006.

Further, Applicants note that all rejections of the Office Action dated July 24, 2006, were previously addressed in the Amendment filed October 4, 2006. Notably, the double patenting rejection was addressed on page 13, last three lines to page 14, line 6 from the bottom. In addition, the prior art rejections were addressed at pages 11, line 4 from the bottom to page 13, line 4 from the bottom.

While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's position that the previous response was non-responsive, in order to further prosecution, the Remarks part of the previous amendment has now been restructured. The double-patenting rejection is discussed first and then the prior art rejections.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Basis for Amendments begin on page 10 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 11 of this paper.